

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 - 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,006,265 ("Rangan") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,155,591 ("Wachob"). However, only claims 1 - 6, 8 - 11, and 22 - 25 remain pending in the present application because claims 7 and 12 - 21 were canceled previously. The Applicant has amended claim 1 purely for editorial clarity and respectfully traverses each of the Examiner's rejections. Substantive portions of these rejections were discussed in a telephone conference on May 16, 2006; the Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time spent discussing these rejections.

Claims 1 – 6 and 8 - 11

In claim 1, the Applicant recites a method of transmitting multimedia from a network server information over a data network. The method includes, among other things, receiving through a screen display demographic information for the at least one system user and using the IP address to access at least one database to retrieve demographic information stored therein associated with the at least one system user. Based on selection of a hypertext link (i.e., by the system user), a multimedia presentation is selected from a computer memory and transmitted to the system user's remotely located computer. The method also includes detecting an inserted commercial break during the transmission of the multimedia presentation and, based on the demographic information, accessing a commercial database and retrieving at least one commercial associated with the demographics for the system user. In this regard, the method also includes transmitting the retrieved commercial to the at least one system user during the commercial break.

The Examiner states that Rangan, at column 20, lines 52 – 60, teaches the steps of receiving through a screen display demographic information for the system user and using the IP address to access a database and retrieve demographic information that is associated with the system user. Here, Rangan merely states that a client subscriber/user/viewer (SUV) may click to a hyper video commercial to initiate a Web transaction (column 20, lines 49 and 50 of Rangan) and that the feedback from the transaction results in on-the-fly commercial insertion that may be tuned to local demographic conditions and user profiles. Nowhere does Rangan state that demographic information for the at least one system user is received through a screen display. In

fact, Rangan does not mention or even suggest a screen display for entering demographic information in any form anywhere.

Such a display allows the user to enter demographic information such that preferable commercials may be inserted into the multimedia presentation, which is not contemplated by Rangan. For example, the demographic information of the Applicant's claims originates from system users who have logged on and provided certain demographic information about themselves. This information is stored within a database which allows the programmer to ascertain a particular audience according to the demographic information and subsequently select commercials that are based on that demographic information. *See e.g.*, page 9, lines 5 - 24, page 10, lines 1 - 19 of the Applicant's specification. Rangan, rather, teaches the automatic analysis of streaming video and the insertion of hotspots over hyperlinks to make hypervideo. Column 17, lines 49-53 of Rangan. While Rangan is certainly a challenging reference to comprehend, the Applicant finds no teaching or reasonable suggestion regarding the entrance of demographic information through a screen display as the Applicant both claims and teaches.

Regardless, Rangan's mere statement of commercial insertion in column 20, line 55 is not the same as the commercial transmission of a retrieved commercial during a commercial break. Rather, Rangan's alleged teaching of a commercial insertion generally regards insertion of hypertext links within video content to make "hypervideo", which allows a user to select additional video content during presentation of the hypervideo. For example, Rangan explicitly states that "in accordance with the present invention, the insertion is not of clips... but rather of hyperlinks", column 20, lines 15 - 22. The specification of Rangan is fraught with explicit references stating that insertion is in the context of hyperlinks that are associated with commercials. *See e.g.*, column 18, lines 51 - 59. This differs from the Applicant's claims because, among other reasons, the Applicant claims the insertion of commercials based on demographic information as opposed to the insertion of hyperlinks and at detected commercial breaks.

If the Examiner is referring to the reference of "REAL-TIME TARGETED INSERTION OF VIDEO CLIPS, HYPERVIDEO CLIPS AND/OR HYPERLINKS IN COMPRESSED STREAMING VIDEO, INCLUDING DYNAMICALLY AT MULTIPLE POINTS BETWEEN CONTENT PROVIDERS AND SUBSCRIBERS IN DIGITAL NETWORKS" on column 7, lines 22 - 27 of Rangan, this not a teaching or reasonable suggestion. This is merely a title of

another patent application that was not incorporated by reference properly. The Applicant cannot properly respond to such because the Applicant is unable to find the associated reference. For example, the Applicant does not know if this is the title for a published patent application, patent, a provisional patent application, or an abandoned application; without more, the Applicant simply cannot address the teachings, if any, associated therewith.

In any case, the Examiner states that Rangan does not specifically teach detecting a commercial break but that Wachob does. The Applicant agrees that Rangan does not teach detecting a commercial break but the Applicant respectfully disagrees that Wachob does so. For example, the Examiner points to Figure 3 of Wachob to state that Wachob teaches detecting a commercial break. In Figure 3, Wachob teaches reading tag information that is transmitted by the system head (box 150). "The tag information defines if and when a commercial is about to occur, how long it will last, and which channel the converter should tune to". Column 7, lines 13-21 of Wachob. Nothing in this reference, however, suggests detection; rather, the information is provided by the headend.

Regardless, Wachob is not analogous art. For example, Rangan teaches selection of hypertext links within video content for distribution over the Internet. Wachob teaches commercial insertion during predetermined times via cable television (*see e.g.*, column 4, lines 30-35 of Wachob). The Examiner in the recent phone conversation essentially stated that even though both are directed to different types of arts, they attempt to solve the same problem. The Applicant respectfully disagrees because among other reasons, the types of content are totally different. For example, Rangan delivers audio and/or video content digitally via Internet protocols through an Internet network (*see e.g.*, Figure 1 and column 24, lines 32 - 51 of Rangan). Wachob delivers audio and/or video content in an analog fashion via radio frequency AM or FM modulation schemes (*see e.g.*, Figure 1 and column 4, lines 56 - 68 and column 1 - 7 of Wachob). Saying that these two types of content insertion solve the same problem is roughly the same as saying that boats and cars are analogous arts because they solve the problem of transporting people from one point to another. Such analysis is inconsistent with the reasonableness standard stated in *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1447 (C.A.Fed.,1992) (stating "it is necessary to consider the reality of the circumstances... -in other words, *common sense* - in deciding in which fields a person of ordinary skill would reasonably be expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor. See also MPEP § 2141.01(a).

Even if the two references were analogous art, there is simply no motivation to combine. For example, Wachob is specifically related to delivering content to cable television user via the converter (a.k.a. a set-top-box) of Figure 1 used in conjunction with the remote control of Figure 2. Rangan does not teach or reasonably suggest the use of such boxes because all of Rangan's communications are performed via computers through the Internet.

In any case, since neither Rangan nor Wachob teach or reasonably suggest all of the Applicant's claim elements, like display screens for demographic information entrance, either alone or in combination, Rangan and Wachob are insufficient as references under the "all elements" rule espoused in *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). The Applicant, therefore, maintains that claim 1 is novel and non obvious in view of the cited references.

Claims 2 - 6 and 8 - 11 depend from claim 1 and inherit all of the novel and non obvious features of the independent claim and are, therefore, novel and non obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 1. However, these claims recite additional features that further distinguish from the independent claim, which the Examiner failed to address. For example, in claim 4, the Applicant recites a step of monitoring the at least one system user receiving the multimedia presentation and accumulating demographic information. Rangan does not teach monitoring a system user's computer to accumulate demographic information. In fact, Rangan explicitly teaches away from the Applicant's claim when Rangan states "This knowledge is not gained by any sort of insidious monitoring of the Client SUVs. Instead, it should be recognized that the Client SUVs from time to time identify, and link, to the (hyper)video that each wishes to view." Column 18, lines 7 - 11. For at least these reasons, claim 4 is novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 4.

As another example, claim 5 recites a step of detecting a commercial break being performed for ad hoc commercial breaks. As Examiner points out, Rangan does not teach detecting a commercial break let alone an ad hoc commercial break. An ad hoc commercial break of the Applicant's claims is a type of commercial which may be shown during a program which has a number of nondesignated commercial breaks. Examples of such include sporting events having commercials being shown during unpredictable timeouts. Page 10, lines 15 - 19 of the present application.

The Applicant has already shown that Wachob does not teach detection of a commercial break. As such, Wachob cannot teach detection of an ad hoc commercial break. In fact, Wachob has no teaching a reasonable suggestion regarding any type of unpredictable commercial break detection. And since Rangan does not as the Examiner points out, claim 5 must be novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 5.

Yet another example of reasons for patentability is shown in claim 9. In claim 9, the Applicant recites a step of querying the at least one system user to provide the demographic information when the at least one system user logs on to the network server. Neither Rangan nor Wachob teach or reasonably suggest querying a user for demographic information when the at least one system user logs on to the network server. For example, Rangan only states that demographic information is used; but, Rangan makes no reference as to how the information is acquired. Wachob, on the other hand, states that information is provided by means of a remote control or "household survey". Column 1, lines 48 – 64 of Wachob. But, Wachob does not teach or reasonably suggest any type of querying of a system user being performed by the network, particularly when the system user logs on to the network.

Since Rangan and Wachob neither teach nor reasonably suggest querying of the system user for demographic information when the system user logs on, the cited references are simply insufficient in nullifying the patentable features of the Applicant's claim. For at least these reasons, claim 9 is allowable in view of the cited references. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 9.

Another example of patentable distinction is illustrated in claim 11. In claim 11, the Applicant recites a step of receiving a login ID from the at least one system user upon logging into the network server. Nowhere does Rangan or Wachob teach or reasonably suggest receiving a login ID from a system user, either alone or in combination. In fact, the Applicant maintains the Wachob is essentially precluded from doing so because, among other reasons, the non-analogous art of Wachob is directed towards cable television and not the network servers associated with the Internet of the Applicant's claims (e.g., cable television users do not log on to their convertes, now or in the past) . As such, claim 11 is novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim number 11.

Claims 22 – 25

In claim 22, the Applicant recites a network server configured for transmitting multimedia information over a data network. The network server includes a schedule data base that stores one or more schedules for the multimedia information as well as one or more screen displays which are presentable and through which the system users enter demographic information. The system also includes a program source from which the multimedia information may be retrieved and a commercial database that stores commercials that are transmittable to at least one system user and that are associated with one or more types of demographic information. The network server also includes a processor that selects one or more commercials associated with the demographic information entered by the system users and transmits those selected commercials with selected multimedia information.

The Examiner rejects claim 22 based on official notice because, as the Examiner states, it is old and well known to schedule when certain information is to be scheduled in order to designate a fixed time for an event. Assuming for the sake of argument that the Examiner is correct, the Examiner has still failed to address where a schedule database stores one or more screen displays which are presentable and through which the system users enter demographic information. The Applicant maintains that neither Rangan nor Machob teach or reasonably suggest such storage. Accordingly, the Applicant believes claim 22 is allowable and respectfully requests such disposition.

In regards to the Examiner's official notice, it should be noted that the Examiner cannot simply pick and choose elements to deprecate the claimed invention as such would be hindsight. *See e.g., In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075 (C.A.Fed., 1988); *see also*, MPEP § 2143.03. The Applicant maintains that storing screen displays within a schedule database is not well-known or old. Accordingly, the Applicant demands proof of such an assertion should the Examiner find the Applicant's arguments unpersuasive.

Considering the new grounds for rejection and the Examiner's failure to address claims 2 – 6 and 8 – 11 in view of these new grounds, the Applicant respectfully requests that a new non final Office Action be made should the Examiner deems the Applicant's remarks unpersuasive. Also, considering the unreasonable delay in responding to the RCE (i.e., over 2 years) of the Applicant, the Applicant respectfully requests a prompt response so that the Applicant may better

frame the application for appeal, again, in the event that the Examiner deems the Applicant's remarks unpersuasive.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Gregory T. Fettig
Registration No. 50,843
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
Telephone: 720-562-5509

Dated: 5/18/06